

REMARKS

The above-identified application has been amended in response to the Office Action mailed July 8, 2002, and it is submitted that the application is now in proper form for allowance.

In particular, the drawings have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objection to the omission of line 22-22 by amending the label of line B-B in FIG. 21, as shown in red in the enclosed copy of FIG. 21. Correspondingly, the caption "SECTION B" has been deleted from FIG. 22 to correspond with the revision of the label of line 22-22 in FIG. 21, and similarly, "SECTION A" has been deleted from FIG. 20.

The reference numeral --64-- has been added in FIGS. 3A and 7, and a reference numeral --58-- has been added in FIG. 7. It is submitted that these corrections overcome the objection to the content of the drawings, and Applicant will provide formal drawings at an appropriate time following allowance of claims of the application.

The specification was amended on page 1 as required by the Examiner to indicate that the parent application is now abandoned. Additionally, on page 1, the paragraph beginning on line 29 has been amended to correct its syntax by changing "expedience" to --expedient--.

On page 6, the description of FIG. 19 has been amended to state more correctly that FIG. 19 is similar to a portion of FIG. 18.

The paragraph beginning on page 16, at line 4 has been amended to correct a typographical mistake in the reference numeral --24-- at line 22.

Claims 10, 11, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. In response, claims 10 and 17 have been amended to change "said first key" to --a first key--, since there was no antecedent basis for "said first key". Accordingly, the rejection of claims 10, 11, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 1 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Peters. The Examiner takes the position that the electrical unit disclosed in Peters controls current, "to increase and decrease resistance to movement of the locking member by projecting and retracting the solenoid plunger 32," of the Peters device. Claims 1 and 12, however, do not simply and broadly recite that the electrical unit increases and decreases resistance to movement of the locking member.

Paragraph (f) of claim 1 recites that the power supply directs "current in said electrical unit in one direction to increase resistance to movement of said locking member in response to said first signal, and" directs "current in said electrical unit in an opposite direction to decrease

resistance to movement of said locking member in response to said second signal." In the Peters device, in contrast, current is provided the solenoid 38 in only one direction, as indicated by the electrical schematic diagram included in FIG. 1. Additionally, current can flow through the solenoid 38 only if two conditions are met to provide a completed circuit path. That is, first, the key has to be inserted into the ignition lock 50 and turned to close switch 48, and, second, the cylinder 14 has to be rotated far enough for the ear 68 to close the switch 58 in order for the solenoid 38 to withdraw the blocking shoulder 38 from the path of the side bar 20. Thus in the Peters device, there is no increase in resistance to movement of the locking member in response to a first signal as required by claim 1, and there is no current directed in an opposite direction in response to a second signal generated by a key detector in response to detecting a key, as required by claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 should have not have been rejected as anticipated by the Peters reference.

Similarly, claim 12 requires "a movement detector that generates a first condition in response to movement of said locking member;" and requires that the locking mechanism increase "resistance to movement of said locking member in response to said first condition," If movement of the ear 68 to close the switch 58 of the Peters device is taken to be generation of a first condition by a movement detector in response to the movement of the locking member, as suggested

by the Examiner, the Peters device does not increase resistance to movement of the locking member in response to the first condition, and closure of the switch 58 is only one of two required switch closures that can result only in decreasing resistance to movement of the locking member, by withdrawal of the blocking shoulder 36 from the path of the ear 20. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 12 as being anticipated by Peters should also be withdrawn.

Since neither of the independent claims 1 and 12 is anticipated by Peters, nor has been rejected on any other basis, it is submitted that claims 1 and 12 should be allowed.

Claims 4-11 depend from claim 1 and should be allowed for the same reasons set forth with respect to claim 1. New claim 35 has been added to replace claim 2, which was inadvertently canceled instead of claim 3, which has now been canceled. Since claim 35 depends from claim 1, it, too, should now be allowed.

Claims 13 and 15-18 depend from claim 12 and should now be allowed for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 12.

Claim 5 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Peters in view of Armoogam. While Armoogam discloses a solenoid that when actuated retracts a bar from a position blocking a latch member, and a spring which removes the latch member from a position interfering with movement of a locking member, the combination of the

disclosures of Peters and Armoogam still fails to suggest a power supply directing current in a direction to increase resistance to movement of the locking member in response to a first signal, and the rejection of claim 5 over the combination should therefore be withdrawn.

Claim 15, dependent from claim 12, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Peters in view of Schwartz et al. Schwartz et al. is cited for its disclosure of a motor 31 controlling the latch member 37. There is no disclosure in either of Peters or Schwartz et al., however, of a locking mechanism that increases resistance to movement of the locking member in response to a first condition generated by a movement detector in response to movement of the locking member, and so the cited combination of references fails to suggest the subject matter of claim 15, which should therefore be found allowable.

Claims 10, 11, 17, and 18 were rejected as unpatentable over Peters in view of Bianco or Clarkson et al. Claims 10 and 17 both require key management systems wherein a first key detected by the key detector of claim 1 or claim 12, respectively, becomes a master key.

Neither Bianco nor Clarkson et al. provides the direction of current in a first direction to increase resistance to movement of the locking member in response to a first signal, as recited in claim 1, but not taught by Peters, or the locking mechanism increasing resistance to movement of

the locking member in response to a first condition generated in response to detection of movement of the locking member by a movement detector, as recited in claim 12, but not taught by Peters. Accordingly, the subject matter of claims 10 and 17, and of claims 11 and 18 respectively dependent therefrom, is not suggested by the cited combinations of references.

Additionally, neither Bianco nor Clarkson et al. discloses a key management system in which a first key detected by a key detector becomes a master key for the electronic access control system concerned. Instead, Bianco teaches provision of a password to a microcontroller 170 from a microprocessor 152, at column 7, lines 28-29, and requires a key to be programmed appropriately for the lock.

Clarkson et al. teaches the use of a key management system, discussed in column 15 at lines 3-55, but requires keys to be encoded at a remote station to transmit codes to the lock cylinder, and fails to suggest a system in which the first key detected by a key detector in the access control device becomes the master key. Accordingly, claims 10, 11, 17, and 18 should not have been rejected as unpatentable over Peters in view of Bianco or Clarkson et al. and should be allowed.

The VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE attached hereto shows the manner in which the specification and claims 10 and 17 have been amended.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks the Examiner is requested to reexamine the application, to allow claims 1, 4-13, 15-18, and 35, all of the claims remaining in the application, and to pass the application on promptly to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald B. Haslett
Reg. No. 28,855
Of Attorneys for Applicant
Tel: (503) 227-5631

Q:\Jennifer\wpdocs\DBH\Videx, Inc\Amendment 021008.frm